

Chapter XIV

FATHER ARRUPE AND THE JESUITS AT THE EUCCHARISTIC CONGRESS IN BOGOTÁ, AND THEIR ROLE IN THE SUBVERSION OF LATIN AMERICA

No doubt one of the phenomena that has especially surprised and impressed all Catholic and non-Catholic observers who have eyes and do not close them to reality even though it be sad and painful, consists of the spectacular, demolishing, and to me, incomprehensible changes that have occurred over the past few years in one of the most renowned and meritorious religious orders, the Society of Jesus. It appears as though, having forgotten the counter-Reformation fight, their most noble mottoes, "to the greater glory of God," and "the inner law of charity that the Holy Ghost writes and prints in every heart," as well as the very Ignatian rules and spirit, the new Jesuits, have become not one of the instruments, but *the* most efficacious and efficient instrument of the socio-economic, socio-political, socio-moral, and socio-religious "revolution" that has overturned our world. Please be reminded that I am not speaking about the old, marginated Jesuits who impotently cry out their tragedy, and who are "exclusively dedicated" to the "*apostolate of social justice*," as their General himself said.

This is no local or circumstantial phenomenon which affects isolated Jesuits. It is a world process, programmed, led, and fostered by the Father General and all the heads of the Order. It seems that Fr. Arrupe, the Provost General of the Society of Jesus, and his assistant advisors follow directions coming from above, which they use to justify the unheard-of changes that are adulterating the work of Ignatius of Loyola before their own consciences and before all the members of their Society. My suspicion was supported by a conversation I had at Rome with Fr. Arrupe in his very room, not long ago. Using my characteristic clearness and frankness, and my rights as a trainee of the Jesuits for more than thirty years, during which time I gave up the best part of my life to God's service within the Society, and taking into account Fr. Arrupe's position as successor of Saint Ignatius, I stated the sad condition of the present Society—divided, secularized, and absolutely turned aside from the literal meaning and spirit of its constitution. Father Arrupe listened to me with evident quietness and, let me say, benevolence. Then he asked me: "What can I do?" The Father General did not know what to do! At the end, he very

graciously gave me a medal and a picture of himself. On the medal and in the picture, Fr. Arrupe is kneeling before Paul VI, who is blessing him. This photograph and medal appeared to me as a complete answer and the very justification that the Jesuit superiors use to defend their administration: "*The Pope wants it; the Pope orders and blesses it; and we, by virtue of our special oath of obedience to the Pope, must obey.*"

There is still more evidence supporting this interpretation of mine. Not long ago, I talked with a relative of Fr. Enrique Maza, the Jesuit who conducts subversion in Mexico. We spoke about the sad case of Fr. Felipe Parinas, still a Father, despite his dispensation, and who by now has a son whom he named John Ernest, *John* after the Pope of Tolerance and *Ernest* after "Ché" Guevara. Enrique's relative agreed with me in regretting and censoring Felipe's cynicism, with which he wanted to conceal his infidelity. I took the opportunity of our chat to let Enrique's relative know what many people think about Enrique's ultra-radical progressivist mood. He is following, I said, the same path that Fr. Pardinas did. My interlocutor agreed with my sad augury and prognostication that Enrique was following the path that had led Felipe not only to marriage but to his new and strange "experiences" of Christ. However, the common blood finally reacted and the person with whom I was speaking tried to defend Enrique, contending he was just obeying orders he had received from the Father Provincial.

"What are you saying, Madam?" asked I, disturbed. "Do you mean the Father Provincial not only conceals, but authorized and orders Enrique to follow this path?"

"That is correct!" answered that respectable lady. "The Father Provincial told Enrique to follow such a path and that he would support him."

I suspected so! Given the vigilance and censorship that has always existed in the Society, continuous defiance is just impossible, especially concerning such public things as Felipe's and Enrique's speeches over television and their writings in journals and magazines. It would be childish to think that the superiors, engaged in their most high duty of fulfilling orders from above, lack the time to get to know this rubbish that scandalized and continues to scandalize all of Mexico. The consequence, then, is simply terrible: it is the superiors of this modern "official" Society who support and disseminate world subversion, in which Pardinas and Maza are but mere suitable instruments.

"But," our readers might ask, "who is Fr. Arrupe?" We will give a summary of his background. Pedro Arrupe was born in Bilbao, Spain, on November 14, 1907. His father was a most famous propagandist of Saint Ignatius Loyola's Exercises. Every year he recruited a team of men from his acquaintances in Bilbao who gathered at Loyola during Holy Week. One may suppose the idea of giving that region a Catholic newspaper, today known as *Northern Gazette* (*La Gaceta del Norte*) came from one of these teams,

specifically, that of 1901. Mr. Arrupe was one of the co-founders of said newspaper.

Pedro Arrupe studied at the Colegio de los Escolapios for six years (1916-1922). From 1918 on he was a member of the Marian congregation of said city. He soon became a member of the governing body, first as head of the dramatic section, and then as a vice-prefect. The magazine *Flowers and Fruits* recorded his first contributions.

In 1922 he moved to Madrid to study medicine at the university, but on January 14, 1927, he interrupted his study of medicine to join the Society of Jesus, entering the Loyola novitiate. He was studying philosophy at Oña, when the decree of dissolution of the Society in Spain in February of 1931 caused the educational centers of the order to move abroad, in this case to Marneffe, Belgium. Without getting his master's degree, he began his theological study at Valkenburg, Holland, where, under similar circumstances, the Theological School of the Province of Lower Germany was located. He was ordained a priest at Marneffe in 1936, but he still lacked one year of theology which he took at St. Mary's in Missouri, U.S.A. He spent one summer of initiation into the sacerdotal ministry in Mexico, and went back to the United States for his third probation in Cleveland, Ohio. He then devoted three more months to the ministry, this time in New York among the Spanish-speaking population. On October 15, 1938, he arrived in Japan.

After an indispensable period of learning the language at Tokyo, he spent several months working in a social project at Sophia University. In 1940 he became a missionary and pastor at Yamagushi, where he baptized the man who would later become the first professed member of the Jesuit province of Japan. During wartime he had to spend some months in jail "on security grounds." From 1942 to 1954, he was vice-rector and master of novices, then vice-provincial and, from October 18, 1958 on, the first provincial of the newly created province of Japan. He was master of novices when the atomic bomb exploded over Hiroshima. Finally, on May 22, 1965, he was appointed General Provost of the Society of Jesus, during the already agitated times of the last ecumenical council. Now, he is also the President of the Confederation of Religious Communities.

What about Fr. Arrupe's thought? Let us begin with his statements about the attitude of Jesuits regarding *Humanae Vitae* as depicted by the newspaper *El Tiempo* of Bogotá, on August 23, 1968:

There is no problem in accepting the Pontifical document, for *faithfulness to the Pope is precisely one of the essential duties of the Society of Jesus*. I consider that this encyclical contains the authentic papal Magisterium, although the Pope avoided speaking *ex cathedra* about this subject. This encyclical has to be studied carefully and responsibly. It contains very important and profound

anthropological concepts. The Pope's guidelines cannot be discovered through an oblique, cursory reading. One single reading is not enough, and nobody must hasten to comment on it without previous reflection. It is the point of departure to delve deeply into integral anthropology. The Holy Father has provided energetic and clear guidelines.

Father Arrupe's obscure terminology is the complicated, sophisticated, and confused language of today's progressivism. What has anthropology, the science of man, to do with the natural law, the divine law, the science of God? Was, perhaps, the papal encyclical addressed to the scientists and the experts in anthropology? Or is it, rather, a document of the Church's Magisterium in which the Pope expounds to all believers the certain, safe, most clear doctrine arising from the divine law? In such a delicate subject there is no place for ambiguity or philosophical disquietude requiring metaphysical, physical, or moral analysis on the part of the poor people to whom the encyclical was supposed to have been addressed.

But, according to the Society's General, "The Pope's guidelines cannot be discovered through an oblique, cursory reading" [of the encyclical]. What does one *need* to catch Paul VI's thought? Perhaps anthropological training that allows us to find the *licet* within the *non licet*, affirmation within denial? In Fr. Arrupe's integral anthropology it seems possible to adjust the prohibition of contraceptives to tolerance thereof, in cases of human conflicts of opposing duties. Now we understand the rebellion of so many episcopal conferences and the Pontiff's benevolent tolerance.

The journalists, the magnates of the fourth estate, posed Fr. Arrupe another question upon his arrival at Bogotá in the Pope's airplane: "What do you think about the socializing tendencies to be noticed in a goodly part of the clergy?" Fr. Arrupe, whom *The Times* from London considers a compromiser rather than a pacifier, began with the distinction between thesis and persons. This is a very non-committal political attitude and, therefore, very suitable for a General of the Society of Jesus:

I dare not judge persons, for there are always subjective factors in their behavior that we do not know and which prevent us from issuing opinions; nevertheless, the Church may not accept violence. No doubt some socio-economic conditions cannot be accepted; they have to change. But this may not lead to succumbing to the temptation of violent revolution which not only destroys, but also fails to provide a building program.

Father Arrupe defends himself before anybody accuses him; he does not want to judge persons, because in Colombia by then, the sinister ghost of Camilo Torres seemed to project itself over the capital, decked out for the

Congress. But neither could he join the side of the exploiting oligarchy, which he had previously abandoned at the famous meeting of Rio de Janeiro and in the official documents he had written as Provost General of the Society of Jesus. That is why he says: "No doubt some socio-economic conditions cannot be accepted; they have to change." This thesis is brilliant, provided the hypothesis is right. We were in America, in the afflicted Third World, in the underdeveloped countries. Though too late, this situation was publicly and officially acknowledged by the Father General and the Latin American Provincial Fathers. It took the Jesuits too long to diagnose the evil and apply the urgently-needed remedy. Most necessary were the frequent and spectacular trips of the indefatigable Father Lombardi in order that Rome, insensible Rome, the Vatican, and the General's curia of the renowned Saint Ignatius' militia could wake up to the reality of the dreadful tragedy of millions of human beings dying from famine each year due to the slavery imposed by the selfish oligarchies, among which stood the members of the high clergy.

After the diagnosis that coincided perfectly with the radical thesis of *Populorum Progressio*, it was necessary to apply the remedy: a revolution and audacious change of structures, but without violence, "which not only destroys, but also fails to provide a building program." This was a wise answer which, without committing itself, insinuates the indispensable remedy! Father Arrupe continues:

... [C]ontact between oppressors and oppressed, to amend all that has to be amended. This reform is a duty of conscience. At any rate, the real solution must carry a building program. For actually, violent revolution poses a dilemma: either it destroys everything without building anything, or it simply provokes another violent reaction that prevents building."

But I wonder: What kind of contact does the Father General propose? Perhaps there is no contact between "oppressors" and "oppressed" as he calls them. We guess Fr. Arrupe wants a confrontation of conscience, for he discards violence. This confrontation would presuppose a certain intellectual, moral, and cultural equality between ruling and ruled classes, which he prejudices as "oppressors" and "oppressed" which, unfortunately, is not the case. Then in the presence of the oppressors' institutional violence, there is no way except guerilla violence on the part of the oppressed. And Fr. Arrupe seemed to prudently hint this when he said:

I believe that the Latin American condition has to change. I insist I cannot judge Camilo Torres, because I do not know the subjective reasons that caused him to act as he did. What I do know is that violence cannot be admitted under any circumstances.

The above seems to be a categorical answer which, however, is very ambiguous. The Latin American situation has to change; that is certain. He cannot judge Camilo Torres, because he does not know the subjective reasons that caused him to act as he did. Then, according to Fr. Arrupe, there can be subjective reasons that exculpate Camilo Torres Restrepo's violence. Furthermore, can there be any nobler goal than pursuing a social design such as the Father General proclaimed? If the Latin American condition has to change and there is no remedy except violent revolution, it follows that violence is not only necessary, but legitimate. His last phrase is superfluous: "... violence cannot be admitted under any circumstances." It is dangerous to walk along on a loose rope!

Then the journalists posed another spiny problem to Fr. Arrupe, perhaps more spiny than the social problem they had mentioned before:

What will the Jesuits' attitude be with respect to the conflict between traditionalists and progressivists?

This question shows that there are two increasingly opposing parties within the Church. There are two mentalities, two antagonistic positions around vital points, that astonish the world with good cause. These are the pre-Conciliar Church and the post-Conciliar Church. Those who strive to identify both positions fail to understand them in depth.

Father Arrupe answered this question:

The Society of Jesus is trying to make a synthesis, for the Church needs both currents, that of the elders' somewhat traditionalist experience, and the dynamism and ardor of the young, who are usually progressivists. The solution of this conflict is, once again, dialogue. Both sectors have to acknowledge their own limitations, for out of dialogue always arises mutual understanding, at the very least. Dialogue brings about mutual respect which is the best course for the Church. You know that, if a locomotive has no tracks, it loses control and crashes, but if a rail is set up, it can use all its might and run at full speed without danger of crashing. The locomotive consists of zealous youngsters, and it belongs to the others to set up the rail. They need each other, for they are complementary.

This is plain dialectics, the dialectics of age: the elders are the thesis, the young the antithesis. The Society searches for the synthesis. The way is dialogue. The Father General's answer skillfully avoids the stated problem, which is not a problem of age but of ideology. Some young members of the Society think as traditionalists do, in accordance with the Church's old and Holy Tradition as well as the ancient rules that have bettered Saint Ignatius'

institute. There are also old Jesuits who, inexplicably, think as progressivists do. They have betrayed what they had learned for so many years, perhaps in order to keep their privileged status and administrative position even if it be in the kitchen. Better to be the head of a mouse than the tail of a lion!

Old people have limitations, but I believe that generally speaking, they are less important than those of young people, notwithstanding the latter's ardor. Wisdom acquired through experience can be provided only by age, and, as to juvenile ardor, swift and non-subdued passions often darken the very light of reason.

There is a profound division in the Society of Jesus. It has caused the most respectable Fathers of Spain and other places to ask Fr. Arrupe and even the Pope for separation between those who keep on thinking as Saint Ignatius taught them, and those who have accommodated to the new mentality and freedom of Fr. Arrupe's "aggiornated" Society. How could dialogue be possible between those who fulfill yesterday's regulations and the "new wave" of licentious Jesuits? Both groups live together, but are mutually alien. In the past, the enemies of the Society used to say the Jesuits entered the Society without meeting each other, lived without loving each other, and died without weeping over each other's death. Such a saying was slanderous with respect to the true and holy Society, but I believe that presently, the avant-garde progressivists at the bottom of their hearts look down upon old people, who, they feel, hinder their aspiration of maintaining a life adapted to the modern world's demands. Even the Spiritual Exercises written by St. Ignatius have been amended by the innovators!

Poor, marginal old people, illustrious saintly men, whose edifying regular observance, wisdom, and apostolic work enhanced the Society of yore and supported St. Ignatius' work! Now, their labor is over, and "... it belongs to [them] to set up the rail" for those sweeping and uncontrollable locomotives to keep on destroying what their predecessors in the Order had built up.

"Why is it," the journalists asked Fr. Arrupe afterwards, "that young priests are so impatient?" Father Arrupe replied:

Because young people feel the world is changing, and they are right, for *structures and mentalities have to be changed*. But such change is, to a young priest, deeper, precisely because his vocation causes him to live everything more intensely.

So speaks progressivism whose main contention is the change and metamorphosis of the world. The change of mentality Fr. Arrupe mentions is a change of faith. Never did the Gospel or the Catholic Tradition teach that the Church, the religious life, the sanctity and the salvation of souls were functions of the world. Saint Ignatius taught just the opposite. He used the following

words to summarize what his institute was: "The Society asks the world for crucified men for whom the world itself is crucified." Like all progressivists, Fr. Arrupe affirms that the *change of structures* is necessary, urgent, undeferrable, but he does not say what structures need change, nor which ones will be substituted for the old structures that will be removed by those young people whose vocation causes them to live so intensely. Young Jesuits live so intensely that an increasing number of them quit the Order either because in their disappointment, they fail to find the way of saving and sanctifying themselves, or because an intense and quick *aggiornamento* makes them fall into unforeseeable abysses from which the old regular obedience would have saved them! In Spain, the Order's birthplace, the novitiates have been closed due to lack of vocations. Vocation to religious life is no call to demagoguery, license, or organization of student conflicts, but a call to give up oneself to God's service and to work for the salvation of souls.

Father Arrupe still treated another most important point in his press conference. Guilefully, for they knew his thought in advance, the journalists asked him what he thought about Fr. Teilhard de Chardin. He replied as follows:

No doubt Chardin is a great son of the Society of Jesus and one of the most influential men within and without Catholicism. But it must be borne in mind that Chardin was no theologian, and therefore, some expressions of his, while valid as scientific terminology, may be somewhat inaccurate from the theological viewpoint. Chardin's theses form a modern and attractive projection of very deep ideas, but said ideas can be argued when operating in a field that is not theirs.

To the most reverend Father General of today's Jesuits, Fr. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin is *a great son of the Society*, notwithstanding his most grave and undeniable errors against revealed doctrine, its very theodicy, and his experiences with women, to which he himself bore witness and verified his well-known relations with his female confidants and co-workers. Former superiors of the Society became obliged to prohibit the publication of his writings, which had been condemned by the Holy Office, not only once, but several times. Teilhard pretended to obey, but, cunning as he was, he found a way to avoid prohibition and censorship and published his works, which merited all praise and recommendation from Fr. Pedro Arrupe, more valuable than the *imprimi potest*. Now the net result is that the top ideologist of progressivism is none other than "a great son of the Society." He was, added Fr. Arrupe, "one of the most influential men within and without Catholicism." The Provost General fails to disclose what kind of influence this was, although out of the context of his statements it can be clearly inferred that such influence was helpful and enlightening for mankind. Finally we have found the lost link, not by means of

Diogenes' lantern, but by the illuminated mind of this portentous Jesuit who, against faith and reason, has been able to prove integral evolutionism, imminent pantheism, the mysterious identification of life and non-life, and of spirit and matter. Using his supreme authority, Fr. Arrupe authorizes and blesses Teilhard's work, aimed at making a most profound amendment to old Christianity "from within," since Christianity, during its two-thousand-year existence, had lost its strength and message for the modern world.

"... [I]t must be borne in mind that Chardin was no theologian. . . ." Maybe he didn't study his theology before being ordained as a priest? How could his superiors let him be ordained if they were certain he was deeply ignorant about divine science? Moreover they ought to have been aware of his gross errors, despite their concealment under scientific or poetic terminology. Father Arrupe explains this apparent paradox: ". . . *therefore, some expressions of his, while valid as scientific terminology, may be somewhat inaccurate from the theological viewpoint.*" Not "somewhat inaccurate," Fr. Arrupe, but very inaccurate and absolutely opposite to natural and dogmatic theology! They are incompatible with the idea of a transcendent and personal God, with creation (which Teilhard believed did not exist), with the soul's spirituality, and many other fundamental truths of natural and supernatural religion. *Teilhard's cosmic Christ is not the Vatican's Christ.*

I regret very much that a Provost General of the illustrious Society of Jesus appears as justifying opposition between real theology and real science, between faith and reason, e.g., "some expressions of his, while valid as scientific terminology, may be somewhat inaccurate from the theological viewpoint." The above premises now help me understand the ideological confusion prevailing among the Society's many sages as well as the dreadful instability of its new theologians, who teach divine science and other ecclesiastical subjects at the educational centers of the Order.

"Chardin's theses," insists Fr. Arrupe, "form a modern and attractive projection of very deep ideas, but said ideas can be argued when operating in a field that is not theirs." This means that such deep ideas, modern and attractively projected, are true, categorical, and irrefutable from the scientific standpoint, although in the theological field, they turn out to be not only disputable, but false. Said opposition turns theology into a myth and an absurdity that cannot resist scientific analysis.

The Jesuit's Father General was posed yet another question by the foreign journalists who were visiting Colombia at the time of the Congress. To quote:

What might the link be between the Pope's visit and the working up of a concrete doctrine of the Church designed to solve the problem of underdevelopment?

Perhaps no one is better qualified than Fr. Arrupe to answer this disquieting question that was circulating in Bogotá prior to the Pontiff's arrival. He enjoys Paul VI's full confidence and in addition, had traveled to Colombia with the Pope in the latter's own aircraft. But the Father General was able to answer without exposing his own position, or the Pope's. His answer could be interpreted both ways, thus calming some and satisfying others:

About the second point, I just don't know. I feel the Pope's visit will be a great inspiration for Latin America. The Holy Father's presence can give a charismatic and spiritual impulse to the tasks Latin America wants to perform. But I warn you, the solution will not be a technical and concrete one, for this is not the Holy Father's mission. It is possible that, besides what the Pope will say during these days in his speeches, homilies, and even encyclicals, the Holy Father may provide some orientation later on.

To subversives, who hoped the Pontiff's speeches would endorse guerilla warfare, the Father General's words would be encouraging: "... the Pope's visit will be a great inspiration for Latin America... [and] can give a charismatic and spiritual impulse to the tasks Latin America wants to perform." In order to comprehend the hidden meaning of these words, we ought to define some terms this Father uses, namely, "inspiration," "charismatic and spiritual impulse," "tasks Latin America wants to perform." All this terminology sounds very much like that of the IDOC, the charismatic and prophetic Church, which wants to take the place of the institutional Church in order to pave the way for socializing Communism or Communizing socialism.

Father Arrupe seems to support said hope with the words with which he ended his answer:

It is possible that, besides what the Pope will say during these days in his speeches, homilies, and even encyclicals, the Holy Father may provide some orientation *later on*." [italics added].

It is *as though* he were saying:

Take it easy; things will run as you wish. The Pope has some surprises in store for us, but this Congress cannot be as explicit as he would like. The orientation for the tasks Latin America wants to perform will come *later on*.

To those who feared that Paul VI's words could be interpreted by the guerrillas and their allies as approval and apostolic blessing of subversion, Fr. Arrupe says: "... [T]he solution will not be a technical and concrete one, for this is not the Holy Father's mission." Again, this is plain dialectics; the thesis is

that the Pope approves the tasks, but the antithesis is that his solution will not be technical, or concrete; as to the synthesis, it will come *later on*.

But to catch the Father General's thought about these thorny issues, one has to know some documents unknown to many people and, therefore, worth quoting. Public opinion has applied the term, "The Black Pope's Social Encyclical" to three documents of his, namely, a letter addressed to the superiors of Latin America, the statutes of the Society's Centers for Research and Social Action (CRSA) and a letter to all Jesuits working in these Centers. To said documents, I shall add the letter he addressed to the North American Jesuits regarding the black people's racial problem in the United States. The following is the first of such documents:

To the Senior Superiors of Latin America

As everybody knows, from July 25-29, 1966, the first meeting of the Latin American Centers for Research and Social Action (CRSA) was held in Lima and attended by the priest-directors and some priests who were members of the CRSA. I attached so much importance to this congress, that I wanted it to be celebrated despite the many obstacles and difficulties we had to face. I did not hesitate to have myself accompanied by the two assistant priests for Latin America and also decided that the assistant Father for Germany and a Father from the Institute of Social Sciences of Gregorian University should attend the gathering, to give the discussion a wider basis and more extensive outlook. The aim of said meeting was to have the priests meet each other, jointly analyze what had been done so far, create a common consciousness of the social problems and their feasible solutions, and, as a result of their work, hand in their findings and answers to me.

Here we have, then, the most reverend Father General of the Society of Jesus acting as top commander, gathering the senior officers of an intercontinental organization in order to have them meet each other, analyse what had been done so far, and create *a common consciousness* of the social problems and their feasible solutions. He keeps the final approval of the findings of the congress for himself.

Two documents were compiled by the participants and sent to the Father General. The first one contained the conclusions of the congress. The second one, entitled: "The Society's Official Position with Respect to the Latin American Social Conflict," asked the Father General for "a statement that went beyond the documents designed for our [Society members'] exclusive use." Both documents "were sent to the Provincial Fathers and to some experts, so that they could give the Father General their opinions." Once the answers were received and studied, the assistants consulted, and finally the Lord's light asked,

Fr. Arrupe decided to enact the statutes of the CRSA of Latin America, which would stand from then on.

The foreword of the statutes contains an extensive selection of texts almost literally taken out of the Vatican Council (*Gaudium et Spes*), which stress the need for a mental and structural reform, [italics added], designed to curb the scandal of excessive economic and social inequality. Since said inequality is not limited to mere monetary compensation for one's work, it cannot be eliminated by bare monetary increments of such retribution, for instance wage increases. Father Janssens, the Belgian who preceded Fr. Arrupe as General, did not hesitate to expose them on the whole as "*repugnans evangelio*" (contrary to the Gospel) and "*intolerabilis*" (unbearable). The Council, in turn, calls them: "contrary to justice, fairness, human dignity, and social peace."⁵

Mental and structural change! This is the synthesis and imperious prerequisite for all the reforms introduced by the Council and the post-Council, which have provoked a complete revolution in the Church. This change is indispensable to eliminate human inequality. "Ultimately," says Vatican II, "the new society we are longing for is merely a society wherein each individual could increasingly become a human person. In other words, not that he *have more*, but *be more*" (*Gaudium et Spes*, 35).

Father Arrupe is more explicit:

Social justice is not accomplished merely by occasional alms or soothing wage increases. A social order that prevents the exercise of self-initiative and responsibility is unjust to human dignity, even though such social order grant people a just and equitable monetary compensation.

We feel the above words by the Council and Fr. Arrupe are absolutely demagogic, absurd, and utopic. The equality they seek sounds like the echo of the equality proclaimed by the French Revolution, which could be attained only by the leaders, those who controlled power, but never by the enslaved crowds. No doubt the system of fair wages the Church pointed out to businessmen as a duty of conscience used to give the best qualified workers, employees, and peasants who took advantage of it, legitimate opportunities to gradually improve their personal and domestic condition. We have mentioned it before, that human inequality does not always arise from injustice, oppression, or abuse on the part of the ruling classes but from wounded human nature itself. What does Fr. Janssens want? What does Fr. Arrupe and the post-Conciliar mentality suggest to shatter economic and social conformity and to remedy the dangerous, unbalanced conditions that consume society and the human personality?

To repeat from the above, "A social order that prevents the exercise of self-initiative and responsibility," the Jesuits' Provost General categorically affirms, "is unjust to human dignity, even though such social order grant people a just and equitable monetary compensation." This solution, for the last two Generals of the Society, "is unbearable and opposite to the Gospel." The Council, in turn, calls it "contrary to justice, fairness, human dignity, and social peace."

Any just social order must render possible the exercise of self-initiative and responsibility. But, let me ask: do all men have self-initiative and a deep sense of responsibility? I am not referring just to people in the process of becoming integrated into a culture, but even to people more homogeneously civilized. Now then, if not all men have self-initiative and real responsibility, how is it possible for them to give what they do not have? Could we even imagine such an imaginary equality?

When asked who the active agents are who would build up the new society, according to Alfonso Carmín (a familiar name to most exponents of the Church's social doctrine), Fr. Arrupe rejects all *paternalistic* options in favor of entrusting the reconstructive work of the "revolution from above" to the so-called marginal classes. It is time to put our civilization's most complicated machinery into the proletariat's calloused hands, so that workers and peasants may successfully lead the boat of society to its right destination. In Fr. Arrupe's words:

Remodeling the society according to a fairer, more equitable and human pattern affects mostly the poor, the workers, the peasants, and the social classes forcibly kept outside of society without any possibility of adequately enjoying its goods and services and participating in its decisions, which ought not to be taken without their active presence, precisely because such decisions affect most directly these same poor and neglected people. Nobody must substitute for them in dictating the basic decisions concerning their own interests, not even with the excuse of doing it better than they.

I cannot understand what Fr. Arrupe and his illustrious Society of Jesus have to do with the human and secular work of "*remodeling*" the social, economic and political features of society. Neither do I understand what the relation might be between secular and human remodeling of the society, and the duties with which the religious life charges Jesuits according to the constitution Saint Ignatius gave them, of bringing about the primary and essential goal of their vocation. This goal is, in the words of the Order's saintly founder: "Not only to strive towards the salvation and sanctification of one's own soul, with the aid of divine grace, but, by means of said grace, also to tend to the salvation and sanctification of one's neighbor." I guess that Fr. Arrupe, his advisors, and assistants have run off the track and, concerned for what does not belong to

them, have abandoned the rule of their Order, to the grave detriment of its members. The Father General has realized this and, to avoid jeopardizing himself too much, commits "the poor, the workers, the peasants, the social classes forcibly kept outside of society" to actively search for a drastic solution to this irregular and unbearable situation.

But just to mention such a solution in a letter containing guidelines for the Society's superiors means to assume the entire responsibility for its contents. The Father General's letter is no sociological, economic, or political treatise that can or cannot be followed according to the reader's personal criteria, but a letter with a program of action issued by the Provost General and addressed to all Jesuits, who, by virtue of the oath of obedience, has to awaken, impel, and lead the aforesaid reformist activity of the Society he rules. No doubt Fr. Arrupe relies upon the prestige and enormous influence of the Order within some social segments, accustomed to believe every Jesuit to be a sage and a saint and that, above the Society, there is only the Pope and his *yes-men*.

Is it the poor and indigent who, generally speaking, lack not only intellectual and moral capability, but far-seeing vision for selecting able and adequate means of remodeling society, who must carry on this dangerous and most delicate enterprise "with . . . their active presence?" So affirms Fr. Arrupe, who, in a definitively demagogic phrase states that "Nobody must substitute for [the poor and indigent people] in dictating the basic decisions concerning their own interests, not even with the excuse of doing it better than they." This phrase is "consistent with the most pure and up-to-date prophetic denunciation, a denunciation prepared and elaborated according to the style and problems of our historic times," as A.C. Comín tells us, and, moreover, comprises a total program of social subversion of incalculable consequences, of which Fr. Arrupe cannot be unaware. What kind of initiative can those unprepared, indigent, and neglected people provide to remedy their own country's abnormal and unjust social condition, except through violence, guerilla warfare, destruction of others' property, and murder of the hateful oligarchies which, for centuries and without any right, have been violating their rights? There is only one way for the General's rules and suggestions to become a reality, and that is revolution, violent, destructive revolution, even though the victorious will later fall into the hands of even more inhuman and cruel dictatorships.

Indeed Mr. Comín is right in that Fr. Arrupe's letter is "consistent with the most pure and up-to-date prophetic denunciation," in other words, with the prediction of "*materialistic messianism*" and its apocalyptic horsemen who will carry desolation and death everywhere, thus preparing for the Jewish world government, to whom the Father General has subordinated the select militia of Christ's Church. Father Arrupe "unhesitatingly and totally enters the place of danger, that is of the social revolution of the disinherited classes and peoples,

denounces conformism, and announces the great hope that this revolution kindles."

In other words, the General's program for all of his sons, especially his Latin American sons, is to arouse the classes that have fallen into a lethargy and to preach the new gospel of social justice, which can and must be brought about only through the poor, neglected, and marginal people's revolution designed to rid our society of improper inequality. In a Church in a state of "diaspora," according to Fr. Karl Rahner (one of the worst Vatican II "experts," if not the worst one, and a very dedicated member of the Society of Jesus), Fr. Arrupe talks about a world in the process of reconstruction into which the Church has to plunge, but, above all, he talks fearlessly, for, to Fr. Arrupe, the ghost of *défaitisme* (defeatism) does not exist.

That is why we question what Fr. Arrupe writes:

In today's world, the envoy of the Spirit, the apostle, is completely naked. At the level of human values, civilization, culture, technique, education, art, aid, etc., he brings nothing that the world to which he has been sent does not already have in advance and to a degree better than his, while the sole thing that is really his, the announcing of the coming of God's kingdom in Christ the Lord, has no value at all to this world.

This is indeed defeatism, denial of the everlasting life of God's word, which places human achievements before God's work! This is equivalent to ignoring the fact that man has a transcendental mission to fulfill. Even as eternal values surpass temporal values, so this mission of man greatly surpasses the human value that has impressed Fr. Arrupe to the extent of making him lose the vision of life which is given by the first meditation of the Spiritual Exercises, namely, the meditation on the *Principle and Fundamental!*

I take the following from the November, 1970 issue of *Word (Verbo)*, a magazine from Spain:

*CATHOLIC-MARXIST DIALOGUE
AND THE SO-CALLED THIRD WAY
BETWEEN COMMUNISM AND CAPITALISM*

Hard upon the heels of a discussion about "Christians and Marxists in the Modern World" between Cardinal Daniélou and the "heterodox" Marxist Roger Garandy, broadcast last May by one of the French television networks, Louis Salleron published an article entitled "The Third Way" ("*La troisième voie*"), in *Itineraries (Itinéraires)*, No. 145, July-August, in which he commented on both subjects. Below we reproduce the core of said article:

I had expected the Cardinal to stand on the religious field the way

Garandy did on the Marxist field. On the contrary, both the movie he presented and his participation in the subsequent discussion concentrated on the social question, and he seemed to clarify the social issue according to Christian guidelines. Practically speaking, the conclusion the average listener could draw was the following: If Communism accepted Christianity, it would be perfect

He compared Capitalism and Marxism without making any proposal, which means he leaned toward the "Marxist analysis," and could not reply anything when Garandy called his attention to the fact that the Church condemns Communism as "intrinsically evil" while, on the other hand, it condemns only the capitalistic *abuses*. "I would prefer," said Garandy, "that you had condemned the principles of Capitalism and the perversion of Communism."

It was painful or, at least I suffered at the sight of a greatly intelligent and deeply Christian (?) man as Cardinal Daniélou corralled by such questions. I also suffered because, having accepted the presentation of Christianity in its economic and social aspect, which certainly is not the Cardinal's specialty, he was unable to remember that the Christian solution is what the journalist of *The Cross (La Croix)* called the "Third Way."

Ah! I well know why. Above all he does not know the subject well. Secondly, he is evidently convinced Communism has won the game in advance, and the sole issue is to "recover" it, topping it with a Christian sauce that transforms it into *democratic socialism*, the kind of socialism of which everybody dreams, although nobody is able to design even an approximate pattern.

May I point out to the Cardinal, my old friend Daniélou, that the arch of triumph that opens the third way is to be found in the first paragraph of the second chapter of the encyclical *Mater et Magistra*. In vernacular language, it reads as follows:

Above all, it must be stressed that the economic world is a creation of the personal initiative of each citizen, in his individual activity or in the bosom of various associations already established for the common good.

This basic statement radically excludes abolition of private property as the means of production in which, according to Marx, all Communism consists; on the contrary, it includes a most wide diffusion of private property, contracts, associations, and, most generally, free economic activity regulated by the political power, which is the representative of the common welfare, to which the economy must be subordinated.

Such is the Church's social doctrine. Only it can insure justice, freedom, and prosperity, to the extent said goods are attainable. What is left of it, or what is rediscovered of it, explains why the Western countries, despite their vices, are able to provide their people a less unjust, tyrannical, and miserable life than that prevailing in nations submitted to the Communist yoke.

Is the Church's social doctrine endangered? One has to avow it is, according to the French episcopate. But even yesterday it was ratified by John XXIII, and professed today by R. F. Calvez, the eminent Jesuit who knows Marx perfectly and is a French expert in economic affairs.

I cannot understand Mr. Salleron's regret and astonishment at the materialistic and Communistic tendencies of Cardinal Daniélou's words. The latter's very name is suspect, his pre- and post-Conciliar activities are even more suspect, but there is no doubt that His Eminence faithfully follows the supreme directions that inspire and guide his Superior General in the Society of Jesus.

As Provost General of the Society of Jesus, Father Arrupe carries his premises up to their ultimate consequences. In his above-mentioned letter, he decides and proclaims the Society of Jesus' *social reformation*, which purports not only a shameful denial of the Society's entire past, but of the very spirit and constitutions with which Saint Ignatius endowed his sons.

One of the commentators on the Father General's letter said: "To acknowledge that man is no isolated being, but lives within a society, is the necessary basis for the change in structure and mentality which Fr. Arrupe mentions in his letter." That is true, but such doctrine is completely antagonistic with what Saint Ignatius teaches us and upon which Fr. Arrupe and I meditated so many times during the Holy Exercises:

Man has been created to praise, revere and serve Our Lord God and, through this, save his soul. All other things on earth have been created for man to help him reach his ultimate end. It follows that man has to use these things so far as they help him attain his ultimate end. Therefore it is necessary that we become indifferent to all created things so far as it is permitted and not prohibited to the liberty of our free will, in a manner that we do not want health rather than disease, wealth rather than poverty, honor rather than dishonor, long life rather than short life, and so forth. We must long for and choose only what is more able to lead us to the end for which we have been created.

This is indeed a full concept of life that does not deny the social reality surrounding us, nor the urgent problems our earthly life poses for us, but which puts man, each and every one of us, at the very center of our existence, and lets

us see things according to the perfect hierarchy of life's values as ordained by God Himself. What the commentator on Fr. Arrupe's letter affirms is absolutely false: "The more the Christian enters into and commits himself to the socializing needs of the *social body* to which he belongs, the more he becomes perfect." And this commentator adds: "Only this perspective of a 'growing socialization' can help understand the contents of Fr. Arrupe's thought." The commentator is right, but this perspective is neither the perspective of the *principle and fundamental*, nor the Gospel's perspective. Everlasting salvation is the personal end that, above all, man has to pursue in this life. Such is the supreme goal of his existence. Everything else, including his relationship with people surrounding him, no matter the circumstances and his obligations towards them, is subordinated to this ultimate end. Salvation and personal perfection are not a collective, but a very personal business. God did not create us as a heap, but individually. The Provost General, Fr. Arrupe, also says:

It is undeniable that change of secular structures, as such, belongs to lay people, while our task is rather concentrated in changing mentalities.

The above sentence is ambiguous. It leaves the door open for an eventual intercommunication: Change of structures belongs to lay people; our task is rather concentrated in changing mentalities. "But," Fr. Arrupe wisely adds, "we cannot forget that secular activities themselves are not exclusive of lay people." This means that, whenever necessary or convenient, Jesuits can directly intervene in said "secular activities;" they can take part, for example, in strike committees during student conflicts, and discretely foster the establishment and diffusion of Christian democracy and the leading socialist groups. He also states that mentality and structure are not exclusive realities corresponding to absolutely different subjects, but that they have a point of relative convergence in the sincerely Christian conscience and task.

As a matter of fact, the change of mentality that Fr. Arrupe proclaims concerning Jesuits, if not exclusive of them, has to be reflected into action. Ideas are just like clouds which are condensed above our heads, but finally come down upon earth as a storm. The structure is the fruit and consequence of a mentality, and the mentality gives birth to a structure. Such is the most serious danger of this new theology of revolution and the masses, preached and defined by the Society of Jesus' modern theologians, who, at the cathedras of their universities and schools, have infected the fresh and unprepared minds of youth with destructive principles that are presented to them as the infallible opinions of John XXIII, Paul VI, and Vatican II. Since Jesuits are in charge of the leading educational centers for tomorrow's priests, it is easy to forecast the deviation of the mentality of the new ministers of the Lord and the young

bishops who will progressively occupy vacant sees. In reality we can see it right now: the new mentality has had astonishing manifestations even at the top levels of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, not only among young priests who are unable to preach any other way, but also among bishops, who frequently talk about change of structure and social justice.

In his letter, the Father General also said the following:

Therefore I encourage the Provincial Fathers to meditate once again on this duty of humanizing and personalizing society and have it clearly understood, even by those of us who do not belong to the C.R.S.A., so that no one may hinder this *apparently less sacerdotal* [italics added] effort, but cooperate with it as much as possible.

Here we have the secret of these spectacular changes we all have seen, not only in the mentalities, but in the baffling activity of modern Jesuits. Ill-understood obedience makes them see God's most holy Will in everything their superiors say. Then many but not all Jesuits received these strange directions that contradict the old principles of the Ignatian ascetics and the Society's theological science as if they were the new doctrine of God's Church. This basic idea of the Father General is to be found in a definitively bold phrase of his: "*My wish is to set up a center for world social promotion beside me.*" [italics added]. For the sake of the Society, the world, and the Church, I hope that Fr. Arrupe's wish never turns out to be a reality.

Father Arrupe's letter is melodramatic in some respects:

We must avow we have not done our utmost to grant the social the place it deserves in the Society's scale of values. I cannot help recalling Fr. Janssens' eloquent firmness in calling for the Society's *social conscience*, to quote:

Most of us have been educated in high class families . . . only a few have been able to directly know the actual life of workers, laborers, clerks, and low-rank employees hired by private persons or the government. We must get to understand lifelong humiliation, how one feels when finding oneself in the lowest possible condition, ignored or condemned by many, unable to show up publicly because of lack of decent clothing and social education, how it feels to be an instrument of others' wealth while one's daily bread is scarce and one's future never turns out to be safe, how one has to risk one's health, dignity, and honesty in a job that either surpasses or is very much beneath one's strength, what it is like to find oneself unemployed day-after-day and month-after-month, tormented by inactivity and need, unable to educate one's children adequately, but instead, to have them exposed to the dangers of disease, misery and the

street. How one has to weep over many of them who die in childhood due to lack of adequate care, never to enjoy physical or psychical rest worthy of man, when, at the same time, one sees that those who enjoy wealth and even superfluous luxury are able to engage in liberal studies and noble arts, gather honors, and succeed. . . . Let our brethren discover how many privileged and how many unfortunate people there are in their countries.

Inspired by Fr. Janssens phrases depicting the present inhuman social inequality, as well as by other similar texts of his, I encourage the Provincial Fathers and their advisors to check whether in fact they have objectively hierarchized the urgency of the various apostolic activities in their provinces.

The above absolutely demagogic and incendiary paragraph of the Black Pope's encyclical letter seems to be an attempt to readjust not only the Society but the very order of Providence and man's nature. Maybe the Jesuits feel that they are the trustees of divine Providence to remedy all physical and moral world needs? Have Fr. Arrupe and his predecessor in the administration of the order forgotten these words of the Gospel:

No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?

Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your Heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they?

Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature?

And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin.

And yet I say unto you that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.

Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, shall He not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?

Therefore take no thought, saying, "What shall we eat?" or, "What shall we drink?" or, "Wherewith shall we be clothed?"

(For after all these things do the Gentiles seek); for your Heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need for all these things.

But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.

Take therefore no thought for the morrow; for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. (Matt. 6:24-34).

In the above words of the Gospel, as in many others, we find that God's inscrutable providence has wanted this inequality among men, the way He has also wanted us to use our intelligence to earn our bread through the sweat of our brow. Such inequality would perhaps be meaningless to us were this life the only real one. Even so should we have the right to call God to account? Should we have the right to demand equal distribution of the goods He gives us free? But as Saint Ignatius, perfectly consistent with the Gospel, teaches, all things other than man have been created for man, so that they help him attain his ultimate end. Moreover in the order of divine Providence, one's generous disinterest in material things for charity's sake, and his willing renunciation are more helpful than Fr. Arrupe's material security. That is why Jesus Christ began His beatitudes, which we could call the code of true happiness, with the following words: "*Blessed are the poor in spirit* [not all poor; only the 'poor in spirit'] *for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.*"

Tell us, Father General, would the charity or justice you seek as the most apostolic and urgent task of the modern Society of Jesus be possible, were it not for the social inequality you condemn? Please also tell us if in the Communized masses, where equality of slavery prevails, have they eliminated poverty, suffering, cold, hardship, tears, injustice, and the privileged classes who oppress those who are below them? Cubans would give up everything, despite what the Papal Nuncio says, to live again in the times of Batista's so-called hateful tyranny!

Were both latest Generals of the Society of Jesus sincere and their accusations accurate, I guess the holy Society's priests and hierarchs ought to give us the example, selling something of what they have (and it is not little!), to give to the poor. Some millions of dollars, not pesos, would help remedy some of the world needs, at least for some time!

The commentator of Fr. Arrupe's letter says:

Reading the analysis of the situation made by Fr. John Baptist Janssens, we become assailed with doubt concerning the efficacy of texts and directions issued by some ecclesiastical institutions [the Society of Jesus, for instance?]. Perhaps too many recommendations that have had no practical answers have accustomed us to read reform documents coming out of the Church meditatively, but with a good dose of internal inhibition. Presently, in post-Conciliar times, we risk incurring the sin of self-satisfaction, that is, becoming satisfied with a theoretical elaboration of the Conciliar Utopia without checking, as Fr. Arrupe indicates, "whether in fact we have objectively hierarchized the urgency of the various apostolic activities." In this respect, the urgency, insistence, and

reformist orientation of this document by Fr. Arrupe are meaningful.

I feel the activity of the Jesuit Fathers, objectively hierarchized, ought to begin with suppression of good meals, fashionable clothing, cars, frequent apostolic or recreational trips, luxurious universities and not a few colleges, high tuition fees they charge their numerous pupils, as well as the usual trick of charging their benefactors for these "apostolic works" for which they say they do not collect anything, but which are supported by abundant alms they receive monthly from countless benefactors registered in their records.

Father Arrupe has not distributed the Society's property, for he knows he is not the owner, but only the administrator thereof and that, according to the spirit of the constitutions and taking into account the dispensations they have received from the Holy See, said property can be used only for the indispensable support of priests and colleges, as well as students and novices who do not belong to the Society's body, though they have taken the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. But the Father General wanted to be practical, and, therefore, established a new Latin American Council of the C.R.S.A. (Centers for Research and Social Action). Thus the complete name for the new secretariat (remembering that these are post-Conciliar times, the times of secretariats!) is L.A.C.C.R.S.A. Somewhat long, but meaningful, like the "elimination of social classes!"

With respect to the new Latin American Council of the C.R.S.A., the Provincials were right in asking for an explanation of the future faculties of said council, which everybody accepted *prima facie* as most useful. As contained in the statutes, the function of the L.A.C.C.R.S.A. consists of reporting to the Provincials and the Father General (or the latter's social aid advisors) the needs, feasible remedies, *conflicts*, etc., concerning the social apostolate of the C.R.S.A., coordinating the C.R.S.A.'s joint activities, organizing mutual information and aid, harmonizing their various specializations, and so on. But since the reporting activity is an official one, the members of the L.A.C.C.R.S.A., each of them in his own region, are authorized to ask and receive all kinds of information they need to perform their tasks or which are conducive thereto. . . . Their functions will require the executive secretariat to devote practically all its time, and the regional coordinators to devote most of it, to such duties.

This is, indeed, efficacy! The Society has set up a whole apparatus to perform this new apostolate of social justice. The lucky members who will occupy the leading positions are full-time workers, whom the Provincials must efficiently aid. There are "technical advisors," "regional coordinators," a whole "ministry" with subordinate departments, so that the Father General and

the Jesuits may be able to develop an intense apostolate of social justice. But the Father General wants to be realistic and, against his wishes, avows that "the C.R.S.A., as a whole, have been unable to attain the results that could be expected in accordance with Fr. Janssens' plans." We quote:

These motives can be basically reduced to three: first, the social apostolate is the most complicated one, and, due to pressing reasons of conscience and humanitarianism, it has to solve more undeferrable realities, while other apostolates, including the scientific and educational ones, no doubt pose transcendental problems that are, in a way, within reach of the ways and means we have. Second, the Society is not oriented toward the social justice apostolate; it has been focused, according to a strategy determined basically by historical circumstances, to influence the ruling social classes and the education of the leaders thereof, instead of *the factors of evolution which today compel social transformation*. Third, lack of men and indispensable means: the men who, with great effort, have been appointed and formed, are somewhat isolated, not fully understood, and deprived of able means of performing this new *apostolic venture*. Perhaps not all of them were strong enough to overcome the extraordinary difficulties inherent and consequent to the swift course of the social forms.

It is worthwhile to study the three causes to which Fr. Arrupe attributes the slow pace of the new apostolate in which the Jesuit Fathers who faithfully obey their General's and the Pope's directions are engaged. The first cause is inherent to the apostolate of social justice, which is the most complicated and also the most pressing one, due to reasons of conscience and social justice. The wider the field one is trying to cover—"consciencizing" of the working classes, leader formation, union activity planning, demand for urgent and undeferrable structure change and, if necessary, strike, student conflict, urban and rural guerilla organization—the more evident this reason becomes. We mentioned before that institutional violence can be overcome only by unlawful violence, and that the wider the socializing or Communizing program of the Jesuit Fathers' social justice apostolate, the more urgent that violence. Other apostolates, including the scientific and educational ones, entail transcendental problems, but are, however, within reach of the Jesuit Fathers' ways and means.

The second reason stated by Fr. Arrupe, refers to a 90-degree turnabout that abandons the ruling classes to which, due to historical circumstances, the Jesuit Fathers had been linked. Now it is the proletarian classes who are the present evolutionary factors that today "compel" social transformation, the new goal of the modern apostolate. In the presence of Communism's unavoidable success, it would have been preposterous and harmful to God's greater glory to remain attached to the former ruling classes that fate has called to disappear.

The social origin of the Church's priests and religious is enormously important. Our everyday experience of former excessively spiritual positions that absolutely segregated minister and ministry, gives many examples of "spiritual colonization." That is why it becomes important to remember Cardjin's initial motto: "*The workers' salvation will come through the workers themselves,*" and the memorandum of Fr. Díez Alegría S.J., to the National Congress for Perfection and Apostolate (Madrid, Sept., 1956), in which, in stating the principle, "*There is no redemption without incarnation,*" he examined Spain's specific problems of religious disincarnation: "Since the institutes, institutionally and as a state, profess poverty in the Church, doesn't it behoove them to carry on, in an institutional and stable way, the process of incarnation of the Church in the world of the poor?"

The comparison of divine work and human work is, indeed, bold and disrespectful. But let us take it as a metaphor. I agree with Fr. Díez Alegría when he affirms that it is the religious who, because of their very status, must give the example of disinterest in and renunciation of earthly things in this new, so-called Church of the "poor." But we cannot agree, for it could be interpreted in an entirely Communistic way, with Cardjin's affirmation that "*The workers' salvation will come through the workers themselves.*" What salvation is he referring to? How will the workers work it out? Hands and feet cannot lead the head. To speak like that is plain demagoguery.

Finally, Fr. Arrupe's third reason for the turtle-like pace of social justice is the lack of men and means. According to the commentator:

This is a fundamental problem in which we find the drama of the "prophets of our times," who, to be faithful to the Church and pursue their apostolic vocation, have had to clash with ecclesiastical leaders who lacked the necessary sensibility to suffer along with the suffering, and were absent from their historical reality, because of the need of simplicity and dialogue with the believers.

This logic can lead to the conclusion that obedience, which Saint Ignatius so emphatically inculcated in his sons, and past sages have so much recommended, is a hateful hindrance to those "prophets of our times" who are anxious to overcome the barriers of rulings and obedience, and the sooner the better, establish the golden equality which Communist-dominated countries enjoy.

As to the lack of means the General mentions, I do believe it exists and will always exist, for this apostolate is very expensive despite so much preaching about poverty and social justice. It takes money to support so many secretariats, finance so many congresses, make so many trips, pay for

propaganda and leader formation, and allow for all those not-small expenditures that have to be made in times of emergency or conflict, such as those of October, 1968.

Let us put an end to these comments in order to face what we consider to be the most important issue that the Father General stated in his letter. The following were his words:

Finally there remains a subject that is not simple at all. I am referring to the *Society's approach to the Latin American social conflict*. This is a most delicate affair.

On the one hand, I do not hesitate to accept the spirit of "taking sides" and even go beyond this in the sense that the Society has a definite moral obligation to visibly make amends for what we Jesuits have failed and are failing to do to aid social justice and equity. This spirit of reparation I would like to see more vividly in everybody, but first in the superiors, of course.

On the other hand, I have thought it more suitable not to make any oral statement *to the outside*, but to start acting immediately to favor social justice with factual eloquence. Thus as soon as our activity of unmistakably fostering social justice requires and permits public justification, our position will have to be announced without hesitation.

Meanwhile I have made up my mind to take an *internal* position within the Society which I now wish to put into practice at full speed. It is sad and grave that even today there are people in the Society who have not caught the urgency and priority of the social justice issue.

Fr. Arrupe's *mea culpa* is spectacular, and similar to Paul VI's *mea culpa* at the second meeting of Vatican II, when the Pope begged pardon for the mistakes of the Church of the past, due to which, he said, the "separated brothers" had left the way designed by Christ. Can the Father General cast such liability upon his Order, taking into account that the aim of the Society, according to Saint Ignatius, is not, indeed, to attain social justice for the indigent and needy? Has he forgotten that, throughout the history of the Society, there have been countless Jesuits who have not only given up whatever, much or little, they had, adopting the evangelical advice to follow poor Christ, but also abiding by the Order's rulings, have conducted an exemplary life of poverty? Doesn't Fr. Arrupe remember all those Jesuits who, in missions and leprosariums, performed their apostolic duties, silently endured the rigors of poverty, and tried to bring to the indigent comfort and aid to the extent of their possibilities? Doesn't he recall the trials of the novitiate, when the novices were trained to do the most humble and loathsome tasks, not only at the educational centers, but also at the hospitals, and the pilgrimages when we begged alms? Remember, Fr. Arrupe, the times we shared our dishes with the poor, eating the

community's leftover food! How many exemplary saintly men have conducted worthy and unselfish lives of tireless charity quietly, unostentatiously, without boasting of having witnessed the first atomic bomb explosion. In those times, lamented by Your Reverence, many people attended the Society's colleges free, or paid less than the regular pupils, but this was no hindrance to their passing the examinations or graduating, contrary to what is now the case in the Church of the poor and the Society, which has taken sides in the face of the Latin American social problem.

The commentator of Fr. Arrupe's letter says:

Here rises the unbelievably vigorous spirit of prophetic denunciation. . . . This phrase, "I do not hesitate to accept the spirit of 'taking sides' and even go beyond this in the sense that the Society has a definite moral obligation to visibly make amends for what we Jesuits have failed and are failing to do to aid social justice and equity," is, in the letter's general context, something more than a rhetorical figure; it is the core of what Fr. Arrupe wishes and wants to convey to us in the historical perspective in which his document stands. Father Arrupe's position overrides the regular approach of the social magisterial texts which have always striven to proclaim on the one hand, the theoretical defense of justice, while insisting on maintaining an ahistorical neutralism with respect to the social conflict, thus returning to the evangelical principles the strength they had lost. Fr. Arrupe breaks the "angelic tradition" that had delineated Christians from the revolutionary march of history in order to submerge them fully, boldly, and fearlessly. That is why he adds: "and [I] even go beyond this in the sense that the Society has a definite moral obligation to visibly make amends. . . ."

The scope which the new historical revolutionaries attribute to these words of Fr. Arrupe can be inferred from the following words by the Spanish commentator we have been quoting:

This affirmation "to visibly make amends" for our historical sins is particularly applicable to our [Spanish] Church's condition. Taking into account that the Spanish Church was a belligerent in a fratricidal conflict connected with this country's social conflicts, as I have pointed out before, our people, after several decades, are still expecting a sincere gesture, a collective *mea culpa*, as a point of departure for a new approach to the Spanish social conflict.

The aforesaid belligerency is a heavy ballast that requires this preparation.

The Jesuit commentator thinks the "Spanish Crusade" that fought Communism and saved Spain from living enslaved under the Communist clutches, is a historical sin requiring a "collective *mea culpa*" from the Spanish

Church which refused to tolerate, not the Spanish social conflicts, as the commentator euphemistically says, but, I repeat, the unbearable slavery imposed by an atheistic, bloody, inhuman Communism that would have been the complete negation of Spain's history, heritage, and very essence. Should Fr. Pedro Arrupe's encyclical lead us thereto, we will fight it with the whole zeal of our Catholic Faith, for our love of Christ, the Church, and Mexico. The Spanish Church was not belligerent, but Spain as a whole was: the Spain of the Cid and Recaredo, the Spain of Lepanto and Trent, the Spain of Cortés and Pizarro.

It is very sad that the Father General's letter, which, since it was not an *internal one*, (*ad usum nostrorum tantum*) ("for our use only") as these documents used to be called, became widely known and gave further support to the bad reputation of the Ignatian Order. The Jesuits have been blamed for intruding in secular affairs in violation of their own constitutions and for provoking internal conflicts that seriously disrupt the peace of nations. This has been the excuse for the frequent expulsions of the Jesuits and Pope Clement XIV's suppression of the Order. A letter from the Society of Jesus' Provost General such as the one we are commenting on would have been an obviously strong argument for justifying the aforementioned drastic measures.

The texts of the Church's social magisterium cannot overstep a margin of orientation inferred from the immutable principles of the Gospel, the natural law and the Catholic conscience; and, when the Father General casts aside what the commentator called "angelic tradition," he is violating, as we have already said, the spirit and the literal meaning of Saint Ignatius' constitutions, gravely exposing his Order and even the apostolate and pastoral action of Christ's Church. These "marching revolutionary Christians" are disoriented infiltrators who have lost their religious spirit. If Fr. Arrupe has fully submerged himself into such a revolutionary march, he has betrayed the Society and endangered its very existence. Governments cannot tolerate this cassock revolution which, through a go-go liturgy, drugs, and sex explosion, is attempting to disrupt the social order, the pace of constructive work, and the real progress of the people under their charge.

Father Arrupe's letter, "*Requiem for Constantinism*," as its Jesuit commentators Comin, Manresa, García Nieto, González Ruiz, and Riera have called it, is a *requiem* where the bells all ring for a type of ecclesiastic Magisterium that, for centuries, in connivance with the money-power forces, had striven to rule and remotely control the march of God's people. The *requiem* of Fr. Arrupe announces the resurrection of a new face of Christianity in history.

The above words are a tremendous accusation against the Church: its Magisterium, despite its having been set up by Christ, "had striven to rule and

remotely control" the [revolutionary?] march of God's people. But, even more serious is that it has done so "in connivance with the money-power forces;" it has sold itself to and has become an accomplice of dictatorial power and ill-gotten money. But Fr. Arrupe has already recited the responsory, the last requiem for the dead. Now, let us wait for the resurrection of the new Marxist Christianity preached by Ignatius Loyola's sons. The Council, as a historical reality, is over. The breath of the Spirit is still giving vigor to the Church, but we are not satisfied with it. Nor could we be. . . . Comín says:

Every Christian who feels obliged to follow the directions of Vatican II must accept this painful but unavoidable task of *exposing the facts*.

To complete in a more explicit way the progressivist thought, I should add, "And joining triumphalistic Communism's revolutionary march." Society of Jesus, Society of Love (as we were taught to call it), how far you are from Saint Ignatius!